

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/259,849	03/01/1999	PAUL A. FARRAR	303.557US1	5766	
21186 75	590 03/13/2002				
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938			EXAMINER		
			PERALTA, GINETTE		
MINNEAPOLI	IS, MN 55402		I LIGHLIA, GINELLE		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2814		
DATE MAILED: 03/13/2002			!		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A second	,		
	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisom: Action	09/259,849	FARRAR, PAUL A.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ginette Peralta	2814	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 08 February 2002 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	Noid abandonment of this application to the property of the pr	ch places the applic	cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the state of the shortener (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION.  I 36(a) and the appropriate extending the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	s Brief must be filed within the pR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	period set forth in of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:		
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note			
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>			
(d)  they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: So		sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	t(s) a)∏ will not be entered or t rould be rejected is provided bel	o)⊠ will be entered ow or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-77</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>78-187</u> .		–	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disap	proved by the Exar	niner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	<u>5,16</u> .	
10. Other:			

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 09/259.849

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' argument regarding the newly added feature of the conductive layer being deposited after the removal of the seed and barrier layers from selected areas of the insulator are acknowledged, it is noted that the Brown et al. reference teaches the step of removing the barrier and seed layers from selected areas prior to the deposition of the conductor in order to form a seed area where the conductor is deposited, furthermore it is noted that the selection of any order of performing process steps is prima facie obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results (In re Burhans, 154, F.2d 690,69 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1946)), thus the removal of the seed and barrier layers prior to the deposition of the conductor in the invention of Dubin et al. would not produce an unexpected result if they were to be removed prior or after the deposition..

Olik Chaudhurl Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800

Old Charles